



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## SOME UNFAMILIAR USES OF *IDEM* AND *ISDEM* IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS

By E. H. STURTEVANT

I. Introductory.—A passage<sup>1</sup> in Fabretti's posthumous collection of Latin inscriptions, published in 1702, called the attention of scholars to a remarkable peculiarity of certain Latin epitaphs found, most of them, in the city of Rome. They seemed to contain two hitherto unrecognized forms of the dative singular of *idem*, one spelled *idem* and the other *isdem*. The following five inscriptions are typical examples.<sup>2</sup>

1. *CIL.* VI 15389. Dis Manib(us). Claudioe Cypare fecit Claudio Felix libertae suae piissimae IDEM coniugi et sibi.
2. VI 16306. Dis M(anibus). L. Cornelius Saturninus vix(it) a(nnis) XL. Cornelia Sumferousa patrono suo IDEM coniugi bene merenti.
3. VI 21325. D(is) M(anibus). Licinia Fortunatae optimae et sanctissimae libertae ISDEM coniugi T. Licinius Sentianus bene merenti fec(it) et sibi.
4. VI 16534b. Dis Man(ibus). Cn. Cossutius Cladus. Cn. Cossutius. Agathangelus fratri suo ISDEM liberto bene merenti f(ecit). Vixit annis XXXV.
5. VI 24711. Dis Manibus L. Ponti Callisti. Pontia Briseis patrono ISDEM coniugi b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit).

Ritschl pointed out that there is no phonetic difficulty in the way of regarding *idem* as a product of contraction, like the nominative plural *īdem* beside the restored *eidem*. He suggested that the occurrence of *isdem* in the dative must be due to the existence

<sup>1</sup> Fabretti *Inscr. antiqu.* . . . . *expl.*, pp. 291 ff. Fabretti merely stated the fact that *idem* and *isdem* appear where *et* or *eidem* would be expected. Ritschl *Rhein. Mus.* XIV, p. 380 = *Opusc.* IV, p. 385 Anm., seems to imply that he called the strange forms datives.

<sup>2</sup> Other examples are the following: *idem* with masculine subject, *CIL.* VI 5778, 8801, 10219, 12162, 13773, 14529, 14841, 14930b, 16899, 18017, 20675, 22355a, 25485, 25504, 26281, 29956, 35503, X 573, 2412, XI 4487, XIV 564; *idem* with feminine subject, *CIL.* VI 1897, 5360, 6788 = 21853, 7368, 7788, 8449, 9975, 14970, 15600, 17951, 18212, 20270, 20331, 22009, 22137, 23363a, 23897, 24008, 24445, 25377, 35806, 28670, IX 1884, 5849, XI 60, XIV 2386; *isdem* with masculine subject, *CIL.* VI 9719, 10522, 21401, 25319, 35973, XI 4760; *isdem* with feminine subject, *CIL.* VI 9590, 11368, 11840, 12930, 13819, 14592, 15505, 15624, 16810, 18470, 21996, 22354, 28375, 34966.

of that form beside *idem* in the nominative masculine of both numbers. Ritschl's theory is followed by the handbooks of Kühner, Georges, Neue-Wagener, and Lindsay, except that Georges does not mention *isdem* and Lindsay expresses the opinion that *isdem* did not differ in pronunciation from *idem*.

But the dative *eidem* would make no better Latin than the adverb *item* in such inscriptions as the above. And, in fact, *idem* has usually been understood as an adverb by the editors<sup>1</sup> of collections of inscriptions from Orelli down to the present day. I have noticed only two exceptions<sup>2</sup>: Hübner emends *idem* to *eidem* in *CIL.* II 1286, and Bormann says that *idem* is used for *eidem* in *CIL.* XI 4487.

II. *idem* as an adverb.—That there is an adverb spelled *idem* nos. 8–16 clearly show. In nos. 6 and 7 a dative singular is syntactically possible, but the formula belongs with that of nos. 8, 9, and 10 rather than with that of nos. 1–5.<sup>3</sup>

6. XIV 439. L. Voluseio (mulieris) 1(iberto) Dio, seviro Augustal(i) IDEM quinquennal(i). . . .
7. XIV 367 (182 A.D.). P. Horatio Chryseroti seviro Augustal(i) IDEM quinq(uennali) et immuni Larum Aug(usti), ex s(enatus) c(onsulto). . . .

In nos. 8–11 the only possible case of the pronoun would be the genitive.

8. XIV 318. D(is) M(anibus) L. Carulli Felicissimi, bis(elliarii), (seviri) Aug(ustalis) IDEM q(uin)q(uennalis) L(aurentis) L(avinatis), q(uin)q(uennalis) cor[p]or(is) vin(ariorum) urb(anorum) et Ost(iensium). . . .
9. XIV 381. . . . D(is) M(anibus) A. Levi Callisti, seviri Augustali (*sic*) IDEM quinq(uennalis). . . .
10. XIV 383. D(is) M(anibus) L. Marri Moderati sevir(i) Aug(ustalis) IDEM q(uin)q(uennalis). . . .

<sup>1</sup> E. g., Orelli *Inscr. Lat. sel.* II, p. 531, *s. v.* *idem*; Mommsen on *CIL.* III 1193, and as quoted by Henzen on *CIL.* VI 10659, and by Hirschfeld on XIII 2016; Dessau *CIL.* XIV, index gram. *s. v.* *idem*.

<sup>2</sup> Mommsen *CIL.* IX, index gram. *s. v.*, refers to an instance of “*idem* indeclinabile,” but he can hardly mean anything different from “adverbium,” in view of the opinion expressed under the references in the preceding note.

<sup>3</sup> Another instance of the sort is to be found in *CIL.* X 1883. In II 1286, the original of which has been lost, Hübner unnecessarily emends *idem* to *eidem*. Either an adverb or a dative is syntactically possible.

11. XIV 407. Dis Manibus L. Renni L. lib(erti) Philodoxi, mag(istri) quinq(uennalis) coll(egii) fab(rum) tig(nuariorum) Ost(is) IDEM Aug(ustalis); . . . .

In no. 12 the adverb *idem* stands for an ablative singular masculine.

12. XIV 2112 col. I, l. 9 (136 A. D.) . . . [M. Antonio Hiber]o P. Mummo Sisenna co(n)s(ulibus) Kal. Ian. collegium salutare Diana et Antinoi constitutum, L. Caesennio L. f(ilio) Quir(ina) Rufo dict(atore) III IDEMq(ue) patr(ono). . . .

In nos. 13 and 14 *idem* may be the masculine plural of the pronoun used for the feminine; but an adverb makes no difficulty in either inscription, and in no. 13 it is more natural than a pronoun.

13. XIII 1854. (litteris saec. III). Memoriae aeternae Exomni Paterniani quondam centurionis legionari, IDEMq(ue) memoriae dulcissimae quondam Paterniae Paterniane filiae eius; Tertia Victoria mater infelicissima marito et filiae et Paternia Victoria patri et sorori ponendum curavit et sub ascia dedicaverunt.

14. XI 3206. M. Ulpio Aug(usti) lib(erto) Thallo proc(uratori) Flavia Inventa uxor et Ulpia Procula filia de se bene merenti; IDEM decurionibus, Augystalib(us), et plebei, coniugibusq(ue) et liberis epulum dederunt; l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Where a dative or nominative would be syntactically possible, *item* is sometimes so exactly parallel with *idem* that one can hardly avoid understanding both words in the same way; e. g., nos. 15 and 16.<sup>1</sup>

15. X 542 = XIV 425. T. Testio Helpidiano, seviro Aug(ustali) IDEM q(uin)q(uennali) ITEM patrono et q(uin)q(uennali) corporis treiectus marmorariorum, IIII Testii Helpidianus, Priscus, Priscianus, et Felix, fili et heredes, patri dulcissimo.

16. VI 18616. Diis Manibus sac(rum). Fuficia C. l(iberta) Nymphe fecit sibi et P. Valerio P. lib(erto) Addmeto, coniugi suo carissimo, IDEM libertis libertabusque suis posterisque eorum, excepto Forte liberto. ITEM C. Iulio Fausto et C. Iulio Saturnino et C. Clodio C. filio Tyranno fratribus meis pientissimis hoc monumentum feci, IDEM libertis et libertabusque suis posterisque eorum.

The editors of the *Corpus* seem to think of *idem* as merely an orthographical variation of *item*. It is true that final *d* and *t* are often confused in writing, as a result of the varying pronunciation induced by assimilation to the initial of the following word;

<sup>1</sup> CIL. VI 22819 is another, I think, but the inscription is very difficult.

but no such reason can be assigned for a variation between *d* and *t* in the interior of a word, and the indices of the *Corpus* show that it is actually very rare. Aside from the common *adque* and *quodannis*, I find *d* for *t* only in *imudavit=immutavit CIL.* II 462, *tigidos=digitos* X 8249 (an incantation), *adtamen* XII 944, and *parendibus*, Brambach *CIRh.* 1238.

It may be, however, that *idem* really is a pendant of *item*. For the latter plainly belongs to the *idem* group. Even in point of etymology, I think, it should be regarded as coming from *itidem*<sup>1</sup> (from \**ita-dem*) by haplology. At any rate, their similar meaning must have brought the pronoun and adverb so close together in the linguistic consciousness that *item* might tend to become *idem* by analogy with *idem*, *itidem*, and the rest.

It is also possible that we have here the neuter accusative of the pronoun used adverbially. This explanation is supported by *CIL.* XI 1074 (cited below as no. 26), where *eadem* seems to be neuter accusative plural used adverbially. We shall notice a third possibility later on.

III. No proof of a dative singular *idem*.—While *idem* occurs where neither a nominative nor a dative can be construed, I do not know of any inscription where we must take *idem* as a dative. On the other hand, it obviously may be a dative in such inscriptions as nos. 1 and 2; and, besides, a dissyllabic dative from this pronoun is what one would expect. For the dative of the uncompounded *is* is monosyllabic in Catullus lxxxii. 3, and the spelling<sup>2</sup> *iei*, twice in *CIL.* I 205, must indicate the pronunciation *i*. Still, so far as I know, the only evidence for *idem* as a dative singular is furnished by two hexameter verses, Lucilius 1231 (Marx) and Manilius iii. 73. They are, respectively:

uni se atque EIDEM studio omnes dedere et arti,  
and  
ordine sub certo duxit, pars semper ut EIDEM.

<sup>1</sup>The retention of *itidem* in slow or emphatic utterance is, of course, nothing strange.

<sup>2</sup>Sommer *Handbuch der lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre*, p. 449, understands it as indicating the pronunciation *iā*, which he thinks is due to the analogy of the nominative and dative-ablative plural. I have shown (*Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin iō- and iā-Stems*, pp. 11 ff., 22 f., and 32), that *ii* and *iis* never represented the pronunciation in those cases. I have discussed the spelling *iei* for *i* in republican inscriptions, *loc. cit.*, pp. 8, 28.

Both may be examples of synizesis like Vergil's *ferrei*, *Aen.* vi. 280. The Lucilius instance may be due to iambic shortening. They certainly do not prove the existence of a dative singular *idem*.

IV. Nominative singular feminine *idem*.—It is possible, as has been said, to construe *idem* as an adverb in all such inscriptions as nos. 1 and 2 above, and, in fact, in most of its epigraphical occurrences which do not fall into the usual syntactic categories. There is, however, a good deal of evidence that *idem* is sometimes a nominative singular feminine. No. 17 is a hexameter verse, and requires a spondee where *idem* stands.

17. V 6202 = Bücheler *Carm. Ep.* 740.

Cervia quae IDEM vixit Abundantia saeclo,

The inscription has seven false quantities in its five lines, though one of them (*Abundantia*) may be excused as occurring in a proper name not otherwise to be got into the verse. Such evidence would, of course, have little weight if it stood by itself.

In nos. 18–20 *idem* is more naturally understood as a nominative singular feminine than as an adverb.

18. VIII 19198. Iovi Optimo Maximo res pub(lica) Silensium decreto decur(ionum) sua p(ecunia) f(ecit) IDEMque dedicavit.
19. XI 3080. Ex voto Matri deum mag(nae) Diacritamenae [I]ulia Tigranis regis f(ilia) Ammia [a] solo fecit, IDEMque dedicavit.

It must be confessed that there are not a few instances<sup>1</sup> of *item* in similar inscriptions, but the nominative (as in no. 24 below) is very much more common; and in a formula it is not surprising that the common *idem* should be substituted for the rare *eadem*. In no. 20 an adverb would be possible, but strange.

20. VI 19659. Jbona Ianuaria coniunx illius—IDEM annos XXX cum eo gessit et geret—fecit coniugi suo benemerenti. . . .

Bonnet<sup>2</sup> quotes *idem* for *eadem* in Gregory of Tours. I have had no opportunity to examine the passage, and so I do not know the context; perhaps it would be possible to interpret the word as an adverb.

<sup>1</sup> E. g., *CIL*. VIII 12018, 14377, 14698, 15476, 15520.

<sup>2</sup> *Le latin de Gregoire de Tours*, 384. His reference is to Mart. 86, p. 546, 27.

There are a good many inscriptions where *idem* may be either a nominative singular feminine or an adverb; e. g., no. 21:<sup>1</sup>

21. VI 18032. D(is) M(anibus). P. Flavio Crescenti P. Flavi Amaranti filio—vix(it) an(nis) VII d(ie) I hor(is) X—Flavia Euphrosyne mamma IDEM nutrix fecit.

V. Nominative singular feminine *isdem*.—The strongest reason for believing that *idem* is sometimes a nominative singular feminine is that the equivalent *isdem* must frequently be understood as a feminine. That this interpretation is necessary in nos. 22 and 23 is quite obvious.

22. VI 20222.<sup>2</sup> C. Iulio Primigenio—vixit annis LX—Iulia Areschusa liberta ISDEM coniunx patrono carissimo fecit.  
 23. VI. 17082. D(is) M(anibus). T. Duxsio Sagari Duxsia Tallusa libeta (*sic*) ISDEM coniunx patr(ono) b(ene)m(erenti) fec(it).

We have fifteen<sup>3</sup> more examples of *isdem* as a nominative singular feminine, I think, in the inscriptions like no. 5 above, with a feminine subject. They must be discussed in connection with inscriptions of the type of nos. 3 and 4, which differ merely in having a masculine subject.

VI. The nominative *idem* or *isdem* used in place of a dative.—We have seen that Ritschl, Lindsay, and others call *isdem* a dative, and think that it was substituted for a dative *idem* because *idem* and *isdem* were equivalent forms in nominative singular and plural. But we have found the existense of a dative *idem* very doubtful; and the confusion theory is not attractive in itself.

Sommer (*loc. cit.*, p. 452) discusses the matter as follows: “In the later popular language the etymological composition of *idem* seems not to have been always clearly felt; at least the forms of the nominative singular, *idem* and the restored *isdem*, occur as

<sup>1</sup> Others are *CIL*. VI 7790, 20018, 21458, 27196, 29527.

<sup>2</sup> *CIL*. VI 13670 differs from this only in not giving the husband's *nomen*, and in spelling *coniunx* instead of *coniunx*. 13670 is taken from an inaccurate (cf. *CIL*. VI, p. lxii, No. lcv) copy of 220 inscriptions which Ficoroni sent to his friend Gori about the middle of the eighteenth century. He writes that he had bought the originals in the year 1738, but had already sold them. Maffei, writing in 1749, locates the inscription whose text is printed above “in Ficoroni's collection.” Of course, it is the same as 13670. It has been in the Capitoline Museum since 1775, when Guasco published the inscriptions at that museum.

<sup>3</sup> Nos. 26 and 30 below bring the total up to nineteen.

genitive and dative singular (with especial frequency in the city of Rome itself). This points to a fossilization of the pronoun in formulas.” The statement is suggestive, but insufficient. The loss of a feeling for the etymology of *idem* can have had only a negative relation to the matter: it removed an obstacle to change. The factors which induced the change are still to seek. That we have to do with some sort of “fossilization” is obvious, and it is noteworthy that our examples occur in a formula. As will appear later, I think that Sommer is wrong in taking *isdem* as equivalent to a genitive.

The starting-point of the development was, I think, the familiar construction of *idem* (or *isdem*) which Lane<sup>1</sup> describes thus: “*idem*, ‘the same,’ often connects two different predicates to the same person or thing. In this case it may be variously rendered by ‘likewise, also, all the same, on the other hand, at once, very, nevertheless.’”

In the literature *idem* regularly puts a certain emphasis on the identity of subject, but not so in many epigraphical examples; e. g., no. 24.

24. VI 589. Silvano sacr(um). Cn. Antonius Cn. f(ilius) Fuseus aedicalam cum ara et cratera d(ono) d(edit) IDEMque dedicavit.

This formula does not differ materially from *dedit*, *dedicavit* of VI 338, etc. From here it is but a step to no. 25.

25. VI 27556. D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). Pupus Torquatus filius bonus qui semper parentibus obsequens vixit annis VIII m(ensisibus) VIII d(iebus) XIII, item alius pupus Laetianus qui IDEM fil(ius) bonus et obsequens IDEM parentibus vixit annis n(umero) V m(en-sibus) VI d(iebus) VI. Posuerunt Gaianus et Eucharis parentes.  
....

Here the subject of the clause containing *idem* has already occurred, but the purpose of the pronoun is to emphasize the identity of the predicate with a preceding one.

In no. 26 we actually have *isdem*<sup>2</sup> with a new subject to emphasize the identity of the predicate.

26. XI 1074. T. Al[fio?] Ecetio posuaerunt servi quos edukav(i)t, ISDE(M) liberta et servi [e]adem b(ene)m(erenti).

<sup>1</sup> Latin Grammar, § 2371.

<sup>2</sup> Parallel examples with *idem* are CIL. VI 15282 and 24532.

Our apparent datives in nos. 3, 4, and 5 are due to an extension of the construction in a different direction. The essential difference between the use of *idem* in no. 24 and of *isdem* in nos. 3, 4, and 5 is that in the latter *isdem* is followed, not by a new predicate, but by a modifier of the preceding predicate. In other words, in the formula illustrated in nos. 3, 4, and 5, *isdem*, though in agreement with the subject, is used to emphasize the connection of two parts of the predicate. The use of the nominative instead of the dative or the adverb was also favored by the similar formula which puts the words of relationship into agreement with the subject; e. g.:

27. VI 2334. . . . C. Vibio Threpto C. Vibius Tyrannus patronus  
IDE(M) tata eius. . . .

It is, of course, impossible to separate our nos. 1 and 2 from nos. 3, 4, and 5. *idem* like *isdem* should be construed in this formula as a nominative and not as an adverb. Consequently, the twenty-seven inscriptions which, like no. 2, have *idem* with a feminine subject should be added to our list of examples of feminine *idem*.

There are three important limitations upon the construction in the formula under consideration. There is always a nominative expressed for the pronoun to agree with, the pronoun always stands between two datives, and the usage is confined to the forms *idem* and *isdem*.<sup>1</sup> I can find no occurrence of the regular feminine *eadem*. *idem*, however, agrees with a nominative plural in *CIL*. XI 4488 and XIII 2774.<sup>2</sup> The fact that a nominative always appears in the sentence shows, of course, that *idem* and *isdem* were still felt to be nominatives. The limitation to the position between two datives reminds us that we have to do with a single formula that varies only slightly. But the exclusion of *eadem*, *eidem*, and *eaedem* from the construction clearly shows that the tendency was toward a fossilization of *idem* and *isdem*.

<sup>1</sup> *Iisd.* (nominative singular feminine) in *CIL*. VI 13819 is to be compared with the nominative singular *eisdem* in *CIL*. I 576, 577, 1143 = XIV 3002, 1468 = III 1772. Both spellings represent a long vowel that comes from a contamination of *idem* and *isdem*.

<sup>2</sup> Hirschfeld has not seen the original of this inscription, and he has changed the recorded *idem* to *eidem*. Of course, *eidem* stands for *idem* just as *ii* often stands for *i*, nominative plural of *is*.

VI. A third possible origin of the adverbial *idem*.—On the whole, the construction of *idem* and *isdem* in nos. 1–5 is very nearly adverbial. Another step in the same direction, and we should have to call the words adverbs. It is, in fact, possible that the adverbial *idem* of nos. 6–16 above should be pronounced with a long vowel and explained in this way. In other words, these inscriptions may contain merely a still freer use of the construction of nos. 1–5—a use in which *idem* may take the place of genitive or ablative singular as well as of the dative, and in which no nominative need be expressed in the sentence; as, for example, in nos. 6–12. The spelling of no. 28 certainly indicates a long vowel.

28. XIV 345. D(is) M(anibus) A. Egrili Callistionis sevir(i) Aug(ustalis) EIDE(M) q(uin)q(uennalis); Cominia Secundina coniugi incomparabili.

It is quite possible, however, that *eidem* is a blunder to be compared with the nominative singular neuter *eidem* in *CIL*. I 204, col. II, l. 20.

There are two objections to this theory. In the first place, whereas *isdem* is nearly one-half as frequent as *idem* in the almost adverbial construction of nos. 1–5, it does not appear at all in the purely adverbial construction of nos. 6–16. This is the more striking as the nominative type of the formula of no. 11 does show *isdem* in no. 29.

29. XIV 299. L. Aquillius (mulieris) l(ibertus) Modestus magister quinquennalis collegi fabroru(m) tignuariorum Ostiensium lustri II ISDEM Augustalis fecit sibi et . . . .

In the second place, while the formula of nos. 1–5 is evidently a peculiarity of urban Latin, the adverbial *idem* is extremely rare in the city of Rome. And conversely, though the adverbial *idem* is especially common at Ostia, the formula of nos. 1–5 occurs there only once. The two idioms seem to belong primarily to different local dialects. It therefore seems preferable to pronounce the adverbial *idem* with a short vowel, and to regard it as an adverbial accusative or as *item* made over on the model of *idem*, etc.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 316 above.

By assuming that the adverbial *idem* was of nominative origin, we could trace to one source all the peculiar uses here treated. So simple a solution is very attractive, but mere simplicity can scarcely make a linguistic theory more probable.

VII. No genitive singular *isdem*.—In two inscriptions *isdem* has been understood as a genitive singular. One of these, no. 30, clearly belongs in the same category as no. 26 above. That is, *isdem* is used to emphasize a new subject.

30. VI 8860. Agathopus A[ugusti libertus] invitator e[t Iunia] Epictesis cu[linam (?) ex]struxerunt super t[umulum] suum propter me[moriam] Aureliae Epict[esis filiae] suaे duleis[simae.] Aurelia Ire[ne filia(?)] ISDEM fecit.

No. 31 is more difficult.

31. VI 8861. Agathopus Aug(usti) lib(ertus) invitator que(m) ad modum in introitum porticunculae ad monimentum Aureliae Irenes superposito titulo super ostium scriptura continetur, qui titulus attendit in horto, ea omnia de suo fecit quae pertinent ad monimentum sive sepulchrum ISDEM Agathopi quod vivus a solo et Iunia Epictesis fecerunt; . . . .

As it stands, *isdem* must be a genitive; but there is some reason to suspect the stone-cutter. It appears from the preceding inscription that the tomb in question was intended for Junia Epictesis as well as for Agathopus himself. The idea would be much more natural if we could transpose *isdem* and *quod* and read *Agathopus* — “the tomb which the aforesaid Agathopus, in his lifetime, and Junia Epictesis built.” In no. 32 Agathopus expresses himself almost as I think he intended to do here.

32. VI 8862. . . . pertinens ad monimentum sive sepulchrum quod Agathopus Aug(usti) lib(ertus) invitator vivus et Iunia Epictesis fecerunt. . . .

The only other inscription I have seen which seems to have a genitive singular *isdem* is no. 33.

33. VI 11005. Aemiliano filio iucundissimo ac pio et ab omnibus amantissimo, cuius per blanditiem refrigerium laboris creati sumus, Secundus et Sucessa parentes, item Sutius et Sutia ISDEM [ ]nutritores b(ene) m(erenti) [ ]qui vix(it) ann(is).

The loss of a corner of the stone makes it impossible to be sure what *isdem* means. If the following word has not been lost, *isdem* may be understood as a nominative plural and construed as *isdem* in no. 26.

VIII. Summary.—An adverb *idem*, equivalent to *item*, is frequent in inscriptions from Ostia and sporadic in others. The earliest occurrence that can be dated is no. 12 above, which belongs to 136 A. D.

The masculine nominatives *idem* and *isdem* are frequently employed for the feminine *eadem* in Rome, and occasionally elsewhere. I cannot date any inscription that illustrates the idiom.

A large number of epitaphs employ *idem* and *isdem*, in agreement with the subject, to emphasize the connection of two datives belonging to the predicate. The construction is confined to a formula which does not show very much variation except in word-order. It is briefly this: *Gaius Gaio fratri idem liberto fecit*. The usage occurs frequently in the city of Rome, occasionally in other parts of Italy, and once (*CIL. XIII* 2774) in Gallia Lugdunensis.

There does not seem to be conclusive evidence for a genitive or dative *idem* or *isdem*.